DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 456 612 EC 308 598

AUTHOR Doyle, Lynn H.
TITLE Leadership and Inclusion: Reculturing for Reform.
PUB DATE 2001-04-12
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Assistant Principals; *Attitude Change; Beliefs; *Disabilities; *Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inclusive Schools; Principals; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Special Education

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the outcomes of a study that sought to explore and discover how school administrators perceive the inclusion of children with disabilities into general education classrooms and what administrative processes they perceive are necessary to achieve inclusion in the context of reculturing. Nineteen administrators from four mid-sized school districts that formed a large metropolitan area were interviewed, including fourteen school principals, four assistant principals, and one special education administrator. Unlike theories that describe organizations as systems that gain strength in the interrelatedness of components, administrators described education as a series of categorical programs and/or parts that fall along a board continuum. For these administrators, the parts of the educational systems are adversarial and compete among themselves, with special education taking up a significant part of the education budget of school systems. Administrators viewed inclusion through a restructuring lens with its focus on changing how schools are organized rather than on the beliefs, values, and principles underlying current categorical structures. This view was shared by central administration bureaucracies which, although they mandate inclusion, do not relinquish their power to schools. Recommendations for change are made. (Contains 59 references.) (CR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 456 612

Leadership and Inclusion: Reculturing for Reform

Lynn H. Doyle

Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling

Old Dominion University

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association,

April 10 - 14, 2001, Seattle, Washington.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Doyle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EC 308598

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> I think that it [inclusion] probably has some merit to it. If I were a parent, I certainly would be an advocate for it. On the other hand, as a regular ed teacher, I wouldn't get too excited about it. There aren't a lot of children that are accommodatable in the classroom. Students' communication problems, behaviors and conditions impair the teachers' abilities to deliver the curriculum. For the most part, I have not been a strong advocate for inclusion. I believe that there are some collaborative models that work well; and I've seen some cross-categorical, self-contained models that work well, and some resource models that work well, but I just haven't seen that many inclusion models that were successful.
>
> Public School Principal

Inclusion is an educational reform that restructures schools so that students with special needs become an integral part of regular education. However, throughout the years, efforts to restructure schools for inclusion have been marked with mixed success (Lipsky & Gartner, 1997). The literature on school reform indicates that reculturing may be a more effective way to elicit change than restructuring (Fullan, 1993) and that the role of administrators is critical in this process (Wonycott-Kytle & Bogotch, 2000; 1997). The purpose of this study is to explore and discover how school administrators perceive inclusion and the administrative processes needed to achieve it in the context of reculturing.

School Reform: Reculturing or Restructuring

There is no doubt; education is in a period of reform. Nationally we hear the calls from politicians, business people, and educators; schools need to change. In response, there are numerous initiatives underway to reform schools (Comer, 1980; Levin, 1988; Sizer, 1992; Slavin, 1992). Often schools implementing reform focus on restructuring which alters the organization of schools by changing the surface structures, but restructuring alone has been called insufficient and incapable of making lasting change (DuFour, 1995) with reculturing offered as an alternative (Fullan, 1993; Wonycott Kytle & Bogotch, 2000). Fullan (1993) contends that when reculturing occurs, restructuring follows; however the converse is not always true. A school's culture is formed by the assumptions, values, and beliefs that predominate within its members and define how things are done (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Although achieving lasting school reform is difficult due to the impervious nature of school cultures, Schein (1985) asserts that the culture of schools can be shaped as a way to change them thus setting an assumptive foundation for reculturing.

Reculturing efforts target the deeper structures and meanings of schools which, when changed, presumably result in longer lasting reform (Boyd, 1992; Goodman, 1995; Sarason, 1990). Reculturing strategies help school staff members ferret out their beliefs to discover which are shared in the school's quest for its own "set of principles" (Purpel, 1988, p. 45). Reculturing involves altering the dynamics of groups and the ability of participants to self assess and re-assess. Reculturing builds the capacity to critically reflect and ask "why" as opposed to only planning for "how."

A contrast of two ethnographical studies embodies the essential differences between reform efforts that focus on restructuring versus reculturing. Stephen May (1994) told the story of reform at Richmond Road School where the critical goals of the school, cultural maintenance and access to power, were implemented through strong structural organization. May stated that it was the "changes in the school organization [that] distinguish[ed] Richmond Road from other schools" (p. 125). The leadership at Richmond Road transformed the program into one which became internationally known for its approach to multicultural education. However, despite years of success, follow-up reports (May, 1998) indicate that the collapse of the successes resulted because the beliefs of the school belonged to two dominant administrators rather than to staff members. With the departures of the two principals who led restructuring in the school, new leadership was able to return the school to a traditional format because reculturing had not occurred. Teachers and staff members had simply done a good job of implementing the administrators' visions which had been sold to them. Their commitment was not to a set of beliefs that they had established but to developing the structures for the vision that the administrators had established for them.

In contrast, Goodman (1992) told the story of Harmony School where the vision was critical democracy. The organizational guidelines at Harmony School were "intentionally ambiguous" (p. 75) because structure was not as significant as culture (which Goodman referred to as "ethos"). Reculturing was the focus at Harmony School. There were few written policies to dictate behaviors and activities, and therefore, the culture was "continually evolving" (p. 51) The staff at Harmony School could not settle into comfortable, unchanging patterns because the uniqueness of each situation required ongoing dialogue and reevaluation of the ideology. Unlike May's Richmond Road School, a personal visit to Harmony School and subsequent references to the school by Goodman (personal communication, 2000) indicate that the faculty at Harmony School continues to be engaged in an ongoing process of clarifying its beliefs and fine-tuning structures.

Reculturing also requires that change initiatives be connected (Fullan, 1993; Hargreaves, 1995; Murphy, 1991). That is, staff members in schools must be able to see the connections between their ideas about existing conditions and the strategies to reform them. Reculturing means a link or connection of culture to structures. In a meta-ethnographic study of four stories about school reform, Doyle (1998) found that the "overlap" of perspective in four domains of schools, leadership, teaching, organization, and local context, was critical to school success. In their qualitative analysis of the assumptions, beliefs, and values of reculturing, Wonycott-Kytle and Bogotch (1997) found that reculturing encompasses an integration of "structural, behavioral, and attitudinal changes-in combination" (p. 47) which these authors corroborated further in a subsequent quantitative study (Wonycott-Kytle & Bogotch, 2000).

Special Education: Movements toward Inclusion

Efforts to restructure schools for inclusion have been attempted in multiple ways. The goal of educating students with special needs in regular education settings to prepare them for their future lives in mainstream society is inherent in special education legislation. The

Education for All Handicapped Children's Act of 1975, later renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), mandated that students be appropriately identified and educated in the least restrictive environment. Each protection assured by IDEA was met with a response from special education. Over the years, special interests, such as administrative convenience and teacher relief, took precedence over the interests of children. Resultant policies and practices stressed categorical placements over collaborative programming (Doyle,1995; Reynolds, Wang & Walberg, 1987). Least restrictive environment often became what was least restrictive for the special education bureaucracy, not for the special education student. As a result, special education has been called fragmented, segregated, and adversarial (Will, 1986) with excessive emphasis on categories and procedures (Reynolds, Wang & Walberg, 1987).

Since then, there have been numerous movements to restructure special education. With each movement, the regular education classroom increasingly became the standard for least restrictive environment. Each movement had different implications for service delivery and moved closer toward including individuals with disabilities in regular education. Many educators took opposing sides on the issues, and the ensuing debates raised contrasting and ambiguous issues. While many of these reform movements shared some common features, there were differences between them based on two key factors: (a) accommodation, the degree of adjustment that regular education must make to include children with special needs in regular education settings and (b) reorganization, the changes required by special education such as eliminating classrooms and restructuring the roles of special education staff.

Two educational movements that addressed least restrictive environment were mainstreaming and the Regular Education Initiative which led to what today is most frequently referred to as inclusion. Mainstreaming is a practice that emerged in the educational literature during the 1960's and more actively in practice in the later 1970's. Mainstreaming focuses on increasing access to regular education with the integration of students with disabilities and is more "symbolic" than authentic (Skrtic, 1991). It denotes "the placement of exceptional children in the regular classroom (Zepeda & Langenbach, 1999). Under mainstreaming, the responsibility for special education students typically remains in special education which loans students to regular education "for some part of the school day" (Gottlieb, Alter, & Gottlieb, 1991, p. 97). Students with disabilities fit themselves into regular classrooms which often do little to adapt. In the 1980's, some special educators argued that the way in which mainstreaming was being practiced perpetuated the status quo and segregation of students with disabilities. They charged that continued categorization and isolation from regular education was ineffective and morally and ethically wrong (Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Reynolds, Wang & Walberg, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1984) and advocated for major structural reform through a movement which came to be called the Regular Education Initiative (REI). The most radical proponents called for inclusion of *all* special education students into regular education which, they argued, needed to take ownership of students with disabilities and work collaboratively with special educators in implementing Individualized Education Programs (IEP's). Madeline Will, serving as director of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, was a strong advocate of inclusion. Her stance jettisoned the REI from an educational discussion to a political debate (Kauffman,

1989), and special educators became polarized between rational and normative ideologies.

The REI debate was characterized by emotionally charged rhetoric. Politically loaded metaphors were employed by both sides of the issue. Proponents accused special education of segregation and slavery (Stainback & Stainback, 1984) and apartheid (Gartner & Lipsky, 1987) while opponents countered with attacks of fanaticism (Kauffman, 1993). The clamor has quieted somewhat, and the result is what educators now call inclusion. However, interpretations of inclusion vary and range from those who support inclusion for students with mild disabilities (Pugach & Lilly, 1984) to those who call on educators to go "beyond inclusion" by "meeting the needs of students of ALL abilities" (Capper, Frattura, & Keyes, 2000). For most proponents, however, inclusion differs from mainstreaming and is a change in thinking. Inclusion is a "mind-set" (Zepeda & Langenbach, 1999, p. 203) about educating students and "not just a place or a method of delivering instruction. It is a philosophy...[and] is part of the very culture of a school" (p. 204).

Reculturing for Inclusion

Throughout the years, efforts to restructure schools for inclusion met limited success. Efforts to make schools inclusionary have been fragmented and viewed as add-on's (Council for Exceptional Children, 1994), and when school staffs are fragmented and leaders do not connect visions to actions, inclusion is likely to fail (Malarz, 1996). Reformists are accused of focusing on the how to do inclusion rather than on altering the attitudes and beliefs needed for a permanent change (Villa, & Thousand, 2000). In other words, the emphasis for inclusion has been on restructuring without adequate reculturing.

Many assert that all schools, programs, administrators, and staff members need to be inclusionary (Capper et al., 2000; Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Villa & Thousand, 2000). What they are calling for is more than a change in structures but a reculturing of the way people think about schools and students with disabilities. Underlying reculturing for inclusion is the assumption that the administrators responsible for the reform hold strong beliefs for inclusion and can conceive the change processes they would use to reculture schools. The purpose of this study is to explore and discover how school administrators perceive inclusion and what administrative processes they perceive are necessary to achieve it in the context of reculturing.

Method

The methodology used in this study was collection and analysis of qualitative text data (Ryan and Bernard, 2000). Texts consisted of free-flowing narratives in response to open-ended interview questions. The data was obtained from transcriptions of formal interviews conducted with school administrators. Interviews were tape recorded, and full written transcriptions of the audio-tapes were made.

Nineteen administrators from four mid-sized school districts which formed a large metropolitan area were interviewed. Of the nineteen administrators, fourteen were school principals; four were assistant principals, and one was a special education administrator. Four of

the principals interviewed reported having special education in their backgrounds. Twelve administrative interviewees were females, and seven were males. Eleven were White, and eight were African American. Nine of the principals and the special education administrator had over five years of administrative experience; three principals had more than fifteen years of experience, and two were in their first year of the principalship with several years of prior experience as an assistant principal. All four of the assistant principals interviewed had less than five years of administrative experience. Eight of the principals interviewed were at the elementary level; three at the middle school level, and six at the high school level. One interviewee was the administrator of an alternative secondary school for middle and high school age students, and the special education administrator worked across all levels.

Analysis of the texts was through thematic unitizing in which the texts served as "windows into experience" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 637). The overall theme uniting analysis was the perception and meaning of inclusion and what processes should be used to facilitate inclusionary schools. I analyzed the data by examining the texts for the essence and power of perceptions and practices and reduced the texts to codes based on principles from grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Also, using principles from schema analysis, I examined the texts for metaphors, redundancy, repetitions of words, shifts in content, and omissions (Ryan & Bernard, 2000). In other words, during careful readings and re-readings of the verbatim texts (transcriptions), I looked for salient and/or repeated key words or phrases, use of metaphors, and patterns of key ideas. I also searched for and addressed what was not said.

The overall unitizing idea, the meaning of inclusion and what processes should be used to facilitate inclusionary schools, and two of the sub-themes, reculturing and restructuring, were decided a priori from the literature on reform in educational leadership. In relating these themes to special education and inclusion, I identified sub-categories which emerged from the text data a posteriori. That is, these sub-categories emerged throughout rather than prior to analysis. Their point of origination, verification, and nomination (Constas, 1992) was my interpretation of the text data. Said differently, I exposed and named sub-categories throughout the analysis process. I verified each category by documenting through visual displays which confirmed the logical progression of how they emerged and then related findings to the literature whenever possible.

Findings

Education: A Continuum of Categorized and Competing Programs

Unlike theories that describe organizations as systems that gain strength in the interrelatedness of components, administrators interviewed in this study described education as a series of categorical programs and/or parts that fall along a broad continuum. As one principal stated, "Special Education is really one piece of a continuum of services. I think it's the opposite end, of course, of gifted education." For these administrators, the parts of the educational system are adversarial and compete between themselves with special education "taking up a significant part of the education budget of school systems these days." One administrator elaborated.

> Special education has a very powerful lobby in Washington. They are well organized, and they have lots of money, and they push hard all the time. Special education is a good

> thing where it is needed, but if it continues to grow at the rate it has grown recently, it is going to be very difficult for most schools to financially handle it and function. Special education is consistently getting a bigger piece of the pie.

The lexicon of administration is categorical not only as it relates to programs, but also to the students themselves. When asked to talk about inclusion in their schools, one principal said,

> Well, we have DD kids, and the DD kids are mainstreamed. The ED kids are, of course, not [mainstreamed]. Although they are mainstreamed for art, music, PE and those kinds of things–and field trips. And then of course, our PEEP children have their own teacher and their own class.

These categories are quantified and justified on numerical grounds. The facts speak to the categories through "statistical data" which cannot be argued.

> I don't care who you are; nobody can dispute the facts. There are so many assessment tools used to get to the point where a student is found eligible...When we develop the IEP [Individualized Education Program], we base it all on facts. The observations from teachers, the observations from the psychologists, the testing, the educational testing, the past performances in classes. It is hard to dispute this information. But when someone does, it is based all on the facts and the data.

Inclusion: Another Categorical Label and Placement Option

Within these categorical schools of separate and competing programs, inclusion is another placement option as one principal said, "Not every special education student will benefit from inclusion, just because it may be the least restrictive environment, doesn't mean it is going to work for every student. It's another option." Another said,

> I feel like inclusion is one more method of service. Those children who fit into that model certainly should be given the opportunity to be in that model....Where there are many children who can work in a regular classroom with accommodations, then that's a good inclusion classroom.

Those administrators with special education backgrounds did not necessarily perceive inclusion as a way of thinking rather than a category either, and the special education administrator interviewed felt that inclusion was an effective model for students with mild disabilities, but students with more severe disabilities should be included in classes "such as art, music and PE for socialization purposes." She added that the school district had included more severe students several years ago and said, "after seeing that they benefitted from the socialization but weren't learning functional skills, we're now using inclusion less with those students."

When administrators were asked to discuss their vision for inclusion, many described what is rather than what could be. They talked in terms of "inclusion kids" in "inclusion classrooms" taught by "inclusion teachers" in "inclusion schools." School districts in this study designated several schools within each district to be inclusion schools; the rest were not. In most cases, special educators at the central administration office "slotted special education students into one of our inclusions schools." As one administrator of an "inclusion school" said,

> Approximately twenty-five percent of our school is special education. Three classes are

labeled "inclusion models." In these classes, six to eight self-contained students come to a regular education class along with their special education teacher, and a team-teaching approach is used when they are there.

Within inclusion schools, administrators typically designate one classroom per grade level as the "inclusion classroom." For example, several principals in inclusion schools described their inclusion models as, "We're using the inclusion model, on every grade level. I have one class that is designated the inclusion class." Another said, "There is one inclusion class per grade level with six to eight students per class; however, the special education teacher and the assistant for special education are shared by two grade levels," and another said, "I have an inclusion class in each grade and then several self contained special education classes."

In each inclusion classroom assigned per grade level, anywhere from one fourth to one half of the students are labeled special education students. When referring to a 7th grade math "inclusion class," the principal said that "fifteen [of thirty] students" were special education students. In another middle school, "There are normally anywhere from six to eleven special education students in a class with a regular and a special education teacher."

Inclusion students are not assigned to classrooms with gifted students. One elementary principal volunteered, "Some classrooms are designated as gifted clusters, and these have no special education students assigned to them." Principals of secondary schools described a similar situation. One said, "Of course, honor courses, like our AP classes and upper level classes have no special education students, not even resource students. I have some high ability resource students with physical handicaps, but they too are not placed in higher level classes."

Inclusion: More a Mindset of Structures than a Philosophy

Descriptions of what inclusion should look like varied. A few administrators described inclusion as a mindset or way of thinking based on a philosophy or set of values. For example, when probed about having the largest population of special education classes in the city, one administrator replied, "Well we don't use that term [special education] very much. We say that all of our children can learn. I guarantee you that all children within this building have a special need. Some have greater needs than others do but all children come to school with needs." Another said,

> Children, all children, need to be in the least restrictive environment....I think inclusion is best for kids. Kids need positive role models. They need to be in a place that they feel they are the same. I think teachers need to realize that this is the way the real world operates. We try not to pigeonhole children. Some go here; some go there.

However, most administrators described inclusion as the practice of placing students. They characterized inclusion structurally through classroom placements and staff allocations saying,

> Inclusion is when you have a full time special education teacher, a full time assistant and a full time teacher working with the children all day. We have a classroom teacher that is responsible all day and a special education team that is responsible for two grade levels each day. They have to split their time and that's tough–that's tough. The true inclusion

model allows this form of teaching to go on each day, all day."

> I think ideally speaking inclusion would be the best way to do it. But now we have a class of twenty-five students and seven of them are special education...it can be disruptive to your classroom because either they need their work to be given more slowly or you have to stop and deal with behavioral issues. But if you had a special education teacher in the room with you and if you had two versus eight or nine special students, that would make the difference. I would love for something like that to happen.

Others concentrated on the legal requirements of special education. When they spoke about inclusion, conversations drifted back to what the law expected.

> Well, you try to do what is best for the child within the law. It's simple. If you do that, I think you're okay. But it has to be within the law and then it has to be in the best interest of the child. So if you make those decisions, you're okay.

This permeated how they viewed their own roles which one described as, "the principal's role in the Special Education process is to delegate responsibilities and be the mediator between school personnel and the parents of a child with special needs."

Inclusion Looks Like Mainstreaming

The administrators' discussion about inclusion were often characteristic of mainstreaming. For example, one principal said, "In my school, we have a self-contained upper elementary special education class. Teachers from this class take their students to fourth and fifth grade classes for instruction in fire safety, music, art, and physical education." Under mainstreaming, students can actually be placed in regular education settings very little. For example, one administrator said,

> One young lady who is disabled, not physically but emotionally, attends one regular education class, a tools for learning class whereby she is able to go into the regular classroom. She uses the computer. There are things that she can't type on the computer but she gets some socialization skills that are needed. That's one aspect of inclusion.

This same administrator went on to expand his perceptions when he said,

> Volunteers who are students, and as part of their graduation service requirement, go into the moderately to severely disabled room and work with those students during the day. That's another aspect of inclusion.

This example is more characteristic of student tutoring and does not approach the goals of either inclusion or mainstreaming.

Responsibility for Inclusion

Who is responsible for making inclusion work? Some administrators place the responsibility for inclusion squarely on the shoulders of students themselves. For example,

> I think one of the things that should govern when a child comes into a regular classroom should be based on whether they can benefit and whether their presence disrupts instruction. Though most teachers may not always be ready for them, the child has to be ready so he can profit from what's going on.

Other administrators see that too much responsibility is falling into the hands of the regular

education classroom teachers and that they need to collaborate and tap the special education teachers' expertise more than they do. One commented,

> Those teachers should plan together. The message I'm trying to send to my inclusion regular education teachers is that you have a wonderful resource [the special education teacher]. Use that resource wisely; it's a gift. She shouldn't be sitting there while you are teaching all day long. Divide your group. Special education takes one, you take one, and the teacher is responsible for the planning, grading and everything else for their group just like you are for yours.

A few others saw the responsibility as a shared one between regular and special education. One which required a more collaborative relationship between the two programs.

> Actually, co-teaching, not having a special education teacher go into a classroom and be a teacher assistant but actually taking part in co-teaching and teaming with that teacher, assisting with the lesson plans, modifying those plans and being able to actually not just go in there and work with special education students but provide instruction and mediation for all students in the classroom assisting with breaking down the groups into smaller groups and working with the students who may have not caught on to that skill and re-teaching that skill. I don't look at it as a pass by every thirty minutes to talk to the teacher; it's much more detailed than that.

Unprepared and Disempowered Principals

Under inclusion, school administrators are expected to take more responsibility for inclusion (Falvey, 1995; Frohoff & Lindle, 1998; Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Villa & Thousand, 2000). The special education administrator interviewed said, "In the last ten years I have seen more ownership to include special education students as part of their schools by building principals and assistant principals, but I'd like to see them take a lot more ownership than they do."

However, the school administrators interviewed said that not only did they feel unsupported by central administration, they were actually disempowered by it in many ways. For example, principals saw that the central administration made decisions which they transmitted to schools. Mandates came down with little preparation, power, and support for administrators to implement the mandates. "Last year the inclusion model came our way. In typical (Name of School District) fashion, we were just told to do this. Last year was very difficult. All of us had to start doing this without any guidance." School administrators feel unprepared and overwhelmed by the expectations placed on them to make their schools inclusion schools.

> When inclusion was sprung upon the (Name of School District) Schools, no one knew exactly what their role would be including myself. We still don't. I believe if training and support were implemented, inclusion would work much better than it is.

> Last year the school system placed a lot of new initiatives on us. Besides inclusion and the huge standards push, they were very specific about what they wanted. They wanted journal writing, readers workshops, a brand new math series and many more things. It

was truly overwhelming.

Principals also complained about their limited power and lack of voice in hiring and student placements in their schools. They said things like,

> I'm not in a position to hire those who are under my supervision. I am involved with the interviewing process, but I don't directly hire them, and they're not people who I would choose. But sometimes they end up on my faculty, and it's difficult.

> The special education department at the administrative office makes the decisions on which special education students are placed in our school. They also decide who is to be put in which inclusion class settings.

A number of school administrators have ideas that they want to try but feel they were unable to do so due to constraints placed on them by the central administration bureaucracy. One principal complained, "There is not a lot that I can do within this school because I am pretty much limited by what the organization tells me I can do." And another said, "(Name of School District) has a top down, leadership design. There are times when I am even pressured by the organization to be more autocratic."

Processes: Administrative Strategies for Inclusion

Administrators described specific problems and the activities, strategies, and behaviors that they used or feel they should use to address the problems and move their schools toward inclusion. One alluded to the need for administrators to build repertoires of strategies when he said,

> You try to obviously increase your skills. At a principals' meeting, we talked about having a toolbox and how you need to always add more tools to your box but you must be able to use those tools at different times. You must have a lot of tools and strategies in working with individuals and getting them together for inclusion.

The toolboxes that administrators described contained strategies for supervising instruction and good management.

Supervising for Instruction

Most processes that administrators would use to facilitate inclusion consist of supervising for appropriate instruction. These include preaching, telling, encouraging, observing, evaluating, modeling, and empowering.

Preaching, Telling, and Encouraging. Strategies that were high on the lists of many were those that attempted to motivate staff. Administrators do this by preaching and telling as one explained, "It's not that difficult to educate students individually. I preach that as much as possible, and I tell them to keep learning and be proactive." Another elaborated,

> I started out from day one. The entire faculty had a retreat before school started, and I went, and I was brand new to the faculty....I told them how I want to see good modeling and reading from kids their own age, not from adults. I told them from day one, 'You're

going to see my face.'

Others still told staff members what to do but in more encouraging ways that appeared concerned about personal interrelationships and motivation theory. "You have to give them lots and lots and lots of pats on the back especially in front of others," and another added,

> I encourage staff to remain flexible, to seek as much information about students who don't seem to fit the mold for learning or behave normally in the classroom and to seek out those who can provide them information about that. You have to depend on other people; you have to learn as much as you possibly can. Ask; go use those other teachers; it's imperative.

Observing and Evaluating. The strategies that administrators see as most effective for building inclusion is observing and evaluating classroom teaching. During their observations, some looked for exciting, active, and non-traditional classrooms.

> The thing I am looking for is busy children that are engaged in developmentally appropriate activities. I don't want to see children sitting doing worksheets or copying sentences off the board and doing things that are not interesting or not relevant and not engaging to them. I want them to be excited about what they are doing. I want the teacher to have planned things for each one of them–different things for groups that are so exciting that when the teacher says "oh boys and girls its time to get ready to go to lunch." I want to hear a big "OOOOH. Do I have to? Can we just finish?

But this example stands in striking contrast to the principal who looks for the teacher using different worksheets with students who complete them separately from the larger group and then come together for board work as exemplified in the following.

> The teacher may want to use an activity for the special education kids and for some other kids too–and this is where differentiation comes in...The teacher may give them a different type of worksheet (You know a closure worksheet that they are forced to read and not just handwrite the answers in complete sentences but maybe like a multiple choice or matching or something like that as a worksheet.), and then when they come back into class, They go through the exercise on the board . That teacher may want to give those kids a chart at their seat to follow along and you know to help them organize when they are copying the information from the board where the other kids at a high level, they can take notes from what the teacher is saying.

Modeling. Modeling, either direct modeling (by the principal) or indirect modeling (by a mentor), is another strategy that administrators can use to change instruction (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon,2001). One administrator with a background in special education told how she models expectations through co-teaching with new faculty. "This first quarter I am co-teaching with a new faculty member, and I will work my way through all new faculty each quarter. That way I am modeling what my expectations are."

Empowering. One principal talked about empowering staff members. In her view, she saw that being more empowering with staff members was also a way to free herself from day to day management issues.

> If you do a good enough job informing and empowering those that you are leading and supervising, then they're going to start being proactive. People will come up with ideas for better teaching and more inclusion on their own, and that will take so much of the pressure off of you that you're going to be so much more effective. You're going to be able to get to the meat and potatoes of where problems are and really work on solving those instead of staying so involved in the day-in and day-out activities.

Using Good Management

In addition to supervising instruction, administrators try to use good management skills that make life easier for inclusion teachers. They said things like, "I simply try to not knit pick people to death," or

> When this new administrator told me that he just didn't realize all the stuff that went into this profession, like all the complaints about placements, and the parent phone calls and all these other things, I told him that you do know what that means, don't you? It means that we have been doing our job because we kept it away from the classroom. We kept it way from the instructional site; we contained it in the office and dealt with it there, and a lot of people don't realize that.

Others talked about their role in providing adequate resources particularly to support teachers who have volunteered for the inclusion model. Most of the resources they mentioned were instructional materials. While some complained about their school district's inability to provide adequate resources, others talked about how to facilitate additional resources through grants.

> I would not ask teachers to do anything that I could not provide the materials for them. These things you've got to help them out with and if the school division doesn't give them to you then you have to write grants and encourage and help them write grants to get what they need. You've got to get them what they need.

Also, administrators have the power to delegate management responsibilities, and so they do. Since special education "takes up roughly 20, 25 or 30 percent of an administrator's time," principals delegate these responsibilities to their assistant principals.

Barriers Perceived as "Out of Our Hands"

Administrators mentioned two additional obstacles that they faced in implementing inclusion, first, getting teachers to voluntarily participate, and then once they did, getting them to collaborate. Although the administrators perceived these to be important factors, they also believed that they were out of their control.

Recruitment with No Incentives

The practice of having voluntary participation, although meritable, and supported in the literature (Capper et al., 2000), limits the number of participating teachers. Participation in inclusion has remained voluntary in this study's schools, recruitment of volunteers poses serious problems for the administrators. "Lots of teachers just won't volunteer for inclusion." This task is particularly formidable because there are no incentives offered by the districts, a critical factor for reculturing (Wonycott & Bogotch, 2000).

By being the inclusion teacher, that means you also have to attend all the IEP meetings

> for all the children in your classroom. That's another drain on the classroom teacher so the teachers who volunteer-and put that in quotes 'cause I admit that I draft them to be the inclusion teachers-don't get paid more but have a lot more demands on them.
>
> A while back, we got some additional resource personnel so that everyone at each grade level could have a common planning time....Then, when inclusion came along, you had one inclusion teacher in the team planning for her class and having to plan for students who were significantly lower than grade level, and the other teachers on the team did not. There was lots of accompanying frustration, and the stress level was high.

Recognizing the lack of incentives, some principals try to equalize loads for teachers who have special education students in their classrooms. At the same time however, these principals realize that their hands are tied by central administration policies, as one said,

> Well, I wish I could weight each child but that's not (Name of School District)'s way, but I think it's a great idea. I have tried to manipulate that somehow because when I look at the IEP and figure how much time it takes compared to other teachers, it doesn't seem fair. I try to the best of my ability to keep the numbers in the inclusion classes a little bit lower, maybe one to two children fewer because there are greater demands on the classroom teacher, but there's no guarantee from me or the district.

Collaboration

According to Wonycott-Kytle and Bogotch (2000), teacher collaboration is a critical factor in reculturing a school, but when it came to facilitating collaboration, administrators said that the "problem is communication between the adults," a problem they did not feel they could solve. "There's all kinds of territory." Teacher accountability, communication, flexibility, and adjustments to different teaching styles are some of their major concerns which are reflected in the following sample quotations.

> It's like a shotgun wedding. People are thrown together, and there are all those invisible lines and boundaries to learn. What do I do; what do you do? The classroom teacher ultimately feels responsible for the entire instruction program: grades, report cards, and all those things. Typically, concerns evolve around report card time. That's when the rubber meets the road, answering questions about differences in grading, like, How can you give this fourth grade child with an IEP a 'B' when he is reading on a second grade level?"
>
> I'll be honest. When there are two teachers, there are personality clashes and philosophy clashes. There is resentment that one is doing more than the other. Some regular education teachers have said, 'You are getting paid as much as I am, and you are not spending your time planning. You don't have the accountability [regarding the standardized testing program] that I do.'...In our school, we now put both names on the tests, one name on one half and the other name on the other half. That has helped a little bit with that division of labor, but I can't solve their problems.

Discussion

Reculturing is about visions–discovering, establishing, and committing to a set of shared beliefs–with implementation through altered structures. Although schools attempt to effect school change, they concentrate on implementation through restructuring, but they really need to focus their efforts on reculturing for lasting school change to occur (Fullan, 1993). When reculturing occurs, restructuring occurs, but restructuring without reculturing is insufficient (DuFour, 1995). It follows then that reculturing for inclusion involves administrators who first, hold a vision of inclusion themselves, and second, know how to facilitate beliefs-driven change (Fawcett, Brobeck, Andrews, & Walker, 2001).

Administrators' Perceptions of Inclusion

What do administrators think inclusion looks like? By and large, most administrators in this study perceive inclusion as an additional category for placement. They view education as a categorically competitive organization and inclusion simply as another placement category in which administrators can label and place "inclusion students" in "inclusion classrooms." The language of schools is about categorizing, labeling, tracking and competing. Although the administrators' conceptualizations of inclusion fell along a continuum, far too many did not visualize inclusion beyond mainstreaming. Inclusion is an add on, a separate placement category, and special education still owns the responsibility. The administrators described inclusion as placing students with disabilities into classrooms, typically non-core subject areas, which do not adjust to accommodate students but rather expect students to fit into what is there. When asked to talk about what inclusion should look like, administrators described what is and did not have a vision for change. They groped for ideas and examples and described innocuous opportunities in which students with disabilities were merely in physical proximity with regular education students or tutored by them. Unquestionably the practice described by one administrator of having regular education students who were fulfilling their service learning graduation requirement by tutoring in special education self-contained classrooms is not inclusion; it is not even mainstreaming. Rather than socializing students with disabilities into the mainstream of school society, this practice isolates and accentuates the power of regular students over students placed in special education. By using an inclusionary lens, this administrator would have seen alternatives to how tutoring could broaden the views of both the regular and special education students.

By and large, the administrators in this study are reacting to mandates for inclusion rather than initiating reform. They lack visions of their own and view inclusion as a set of classes, not a school-wide phenomenon. Throughout the interviews they focused their comments on changing structures, and their own words do not project that they could alter the beliefs of others to see inclusion as an alternative belief system for viewing students. They view inclusion as a restructuring rather than a reculturing process, and the reform strategies which they described targeted change in structures, not beliefs. Administrators spoke more about strategies to organize students than strategies to organize, facilitate, and develop staff members to determine their beliefs about inclusion. They spoke more about mandates than desires to change.

The reculturing needed by many administrators is high. They do not feel responsible for inclusion nor hold an inclusionary vision themselves yet these are the individuals we expect to instill beliefs of inclusionary education in others. How can they if they do not believe it themselves? Capper, Theoharis, and Keyes (1998) assert that administrators cannot wait for staff members to participate in inclusion. Many of them are sympathetic to regular educators who oppose inclusion and prefer segregated service delivery (Ysseldyke, Algozzine, & Thurlow, 1992). Instead, administrators need "to push the envelope" and "be out in front leading this type of change." (Capper et al., p. 33). But can they when they continue to see inclusion from such a narrow and constrained perspective?

Administrators Perceptions of Processes

For reculturing to occur, administrators need to not only hold an inclusionary vision, but they must also know how to facilitate beliefs-driven change in others (Fawcett et al., 2001). That involves knowing how to facilitate developing beliefs by engaging staff members in dialogues that are driven by inquiry and self-reflection. At the same time, school administrators need to encourage and facilitate implementation through experimentation with changing structures to meet the emerging beliefs. Both processes are interwoven and ongoing.

Developing Mindsets, but...

Wonycott-Kytle and Bogotch (1997) found that "reculturing processes are necessary for developing the new "mindsets" for educating children" (p. 31) and that setting vision should be ongoing with restructuring. Comments in the narrative texts of this study included ideas about changing mindsets for inclusion, but for the most part, the change that these comments reflect are tied to surface structures rather than to beliefs. The focus is on changing teachers' thinking about how to do things and does not address the deeper beliefs behind those mindsets that is the very basis of reculturing. When administrators spoke of the processes they would use to shift mindsets, what they described was doing more of what they currently do There was little evidence of new or different administrative behaviors to facilitate the type of inquiry and dialogue needed to elicit deeper change. No principal described behaviors as facilitating inquiry, supporting critique, creating possibility by giving voice that Reitzug (1994) detailed. The narrative text included no evidence of how administrators encouraged reflection on critical issues related to inclusion. Administrators ascribed changing visions with altering school structures because as Fullan (1991) asserts, it is easier to see and implement specific and concrete structural changes than to make substantive normative ones.

Administrators acknowledged that improving collaboration between teachers was one of their greatest challenges. But the collaboration that they described again was related to restructuring teaching in classrooms, not collaboration for determining and discussing differing beliefs. As Hargreaves (1995) pointed out, creating structures for collaboration (i.e., extra meeting time, re-grouped staff members for planning, etc.) without creating relationships conducive to collaboration is unproductive. The problems the administrators mentioned involved problems in thinking about grading, teaching approaches, and pacing, but there was no mention of principals facilitating teacher discussions to encourage inquiry and reflection about

how to work towards common beliefs. One administrator summed up administrative attitudes toward developing the culture needed for change when she said, "but I can't solve their problems." Although there is a growing knowledge base in the literature which contains specific suggestions for "how to" solve some of these problems, the administrators were uninformed or not interested because they did not hold a vision of inclusion themselves.

Developing and clarifying a school's set of core beliefs is one of the most important but challenging responsibilities of school administrators. Often the first stage of reform is to determine the school's vision and write it down in time to meet central administration deadlines; however, Fullan (1993) suggests that visions "come later" (p. 28). Unlike practices that structuralize and sequence the development of a final set of beliefs, emergence of a vision involves inquiry and dialogue that continues over time (Goodman, 1992; Reitzug, 1994) . The vision is not a product that results from one or two dreaded meetings in which participants create a school vision document. Developing a set of core beliefs that is shared among very diverse individuals is a process that requires ongoing verbal exchanges for clarification, and resolution of conflicting beliefs.

The term reculturing may lead some to think the process has an ending. To re-do suggests a completion point, but such is not the case with reculturing schools. Reculturing for inclusion needs to be conceptualized as constant, perpetual, and ceaseless, a lasting and interwoven process of normative and structural changes. Goodman (1992) provides examples of the perpetual nature of reculturing in his ethnography of Harmony School. The members of Harmony School deliberately did not write their vision statement down because they believed to do so might interfere with the dynamics of their dialogical process. They spent considerable time on inquiry and dialogue to arrive at their shared set of beliefs. That is not to say that the staff did not disagree; however, they did mutually agree on essentials such as, shared learning, critical democracy, and that ideology establishes impact (p. 125). Their conflicts, struggles, and informal conversations were recognized as essential, and the actions of the administrators in the school channeled these activities so that they added to the culture of the school.

Facilitating implementation

Beyond assisting staff members to develop their visions for inclusion, administrators who facilitate beliefs-driven change encourage experimentation to meet the emerging beliefs. They either see or encourage others to see creative alternatives and manage school structures that operationalize these new ideas. From the self reports of the administrators, they perceive that they do perform managerial tasks well. In fact, managing and knowing how to create structures was the focus of their comments. They knew how to create and implement structures for programming and placing students. What they did not describe was how they helped teachers. They described difficulties in getting staff members to communicate and collaborate but did not see that as their responsibility. They recognized that teacher collaboration was a problem related to differing beliefs (i.e., inequities in grading and accountability, differences in teaching strategies and instructional pacing) but for the most part, either did not view that as their role or did not know the strategies to use to address these problems.

Capper et al. (1998) noted that administrators need to use strategies for inclusion that differ from the way they implement other educational innovations including commitment to the vision and empowering others. By sharing power, administrators can create environments for staff members that encourage experimentation because there is a spirit of trust and empowerment. Members are encouraged to raise issues, discuss, and critique practices and ideologies within the school. They are empowered because they have a voice that is not only listened to but sought out. At Harmony School, there were "realms of power" and "spheres of influence" (Goodman, 1992, p. 67). Although there was a distinction between the authority of administrators and teachers, each operated in a sphere where they contributed to authentic decision-making. The teachers' "realm of power" was over content, teaching resources, instructional methods, and assessment. These "realms of power" provided guidelines for responsibilities while still providing opportunities for broad participation into the decision-making process by everyone.

Reculturing for Inclusion

Where do reculturing efforts for inclusion need to start? In inclusionary schools, power and responsibility for special education evaluation and programming are shared between regular and special education. However, too often regular educators remain mere recipients of special education's decisions. While collaboration between regular and special education staff members, parents, and students is one of the most critical components for successful inclusion (Stainback & Stainback, 1984), professional boundaries disintegrate the collaboration and interdependency needed to integrate students' instructional programs (Skrtic, 1991). This can be most acute between the special education central administration and school administrators.

Refocusing Centralized Power

While Chien and Capper (1999) found that a co-leadership model between administrators of special education and school principals facilitates inclusion, the school administrators in this study felt restricted by limited power. When administrators at central administration buildings continue to hold power over schools by deciding procedures and which "inclusion classes" students should be assigned to and which "inclusion teachers" will teach which students, then they hold schools hostage to the idea that inclusion is indeed another categorical label. This is not how regular education placements are made. To do otherwise for special education accentuates differences and builds a bureaucratic framework for school administrators that perpetuates their beliefs in categorization and competition between programs. If central administrations expect regular educators to take ownership of students with disabilities, then they need to relinquish many of the tools they need to do so.

In sorting out the roles of principals and directors of special education, Frohoff and Lindle (1998) found that these roles "are not clearly defined" and that "extensive training and preparation of administrators need to occur" (p. 35). Who decides procedures and placements is a critical issue in this conversation. For years, principals have had little input into special education policy, enrollments, and placements (Levy, 1995). They have been told how, who, and where, and thus have developed a hands-off attitude (Lashley, 1992). While being told that they

are now responsible for special education, many school administrators are still mandated to by powerful special education central administrations. It is not surprising then that school administrators do not feel ownership for inclusion when special education students are placed in their schools and classrooms with little input from the school administrators and staff members involved.

The special education bureaucracy holds extensive power over the processes of referral, evaluation, and placement which have become so bureaucratized and procedural that their purposes are blurred. The bureaucracy over-structuralizes attempts to reform special education (Doyle, 1995) thus reducing these attempts to restructuring initiatives. Rather than continuing this hold over school administrators, special education administrators can refocus power and share responsibilities. They can help expand thinking from "how to do" inclusion to include "why do inclusion" and facilitate, guide, and participate in the reculturing processes needed not only by school staff members but administrators as well.

Reculturing Administrators

We know some fairly definitive things about the strength of the relationship of school administrators to school effectiveness (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986). One of the most definitive indicators for successful inclusion is the beliefs of the school administrator (Rude & Anderson, 1992), yet we continue to ignore the reculturing that is needed by school administrators to attain the vision of inclusion themselves and to understand how to facilitate it for others. In their comparative analysis of the literature, Capper, Theoharis, and Keyes (1998) stated that leaders who hold a vision of inclusion "need to know how to create and sustain change from the reform principals, and they need the dedication to empowerment that the democratic principals bring. These school leaders also need to combine these practices with a vision of commitment to all students regardless of needs" (p. 34). One key method to provide them with this foundation for reform is to provide alternatives in their professional development (Greenfield, 1993). In a study of reform and principal development, Doyle and Huinker (1995) recommended that reform begins with professional development for administrators.

Central administrations for both regular and special education need to see how critical their roles are in reculturing school administrators and that inclusion should never be "sprung on" them without preparation and on-going opportunities. Fawcett et al. (2001) assert that administrators need development in how to address beliefs-driven change and describe one example in which several school districts collaborated to provide intensive professional development for their administrators. Through an academy and follow-up sessions, they guided administrators into seeing the need for change, developing personal beliefs and visions, and understanding strategies to empower teachers to do the same.

To achieve the deep changes that inclusion demands, principals need to know how to work with staff members in new ways that transfer ownership of the issues involved. Administrators who do this support, facilitate, and create possibilities (Reitzug, 1994). They

support by creating opportunities for critique in which teachers have conversations with others in which they ask questions and challenge power distribution under the status quo in their schools. They create possibilities by obtaining resources themselves as well as building the capacity in staff to do so themselves. Administrators need development in how they supervise for inclusion. While some use proactive strategies like modeling and teaching, others only "preach" and observe classrooms monitoring the types of worksheets teachers are using. How can administrators who continue to think that differentiated instruction is using different worksheets for different students be effective leaders for inclusion?

As perceived in this study, administrators do need to be strong in management and structural development for inclusion. They need to continue to place more special education staff members and assistants in regular classrooms for longer periods of time. They do need to continue to regroup staff members so that they share common schedules for team meetings, and clearly they need to continue to mediate with parents, delegate, and follow mandates from central administrations. But school administrators also need opportunities to gain from each other whether that be from inter-school and inter-district sharing or meetings with consultants, opportunities which describe and model strategies such as (a) altering staff utilization patterns so that administrators, guidance counselors, and other pupil services staff members could be used in different ways, (b) building programs that use volunteers and parents more, (c) using alternative professional development activities that target differential instruction, and (d) creating committees comprised of administrators, regular education teachers, special education teachers, community members, parents, central office staff, and other stakeholders charged with assessing the school's current practices and planning for change.

Concluding Remarks

Emphasis in the school reform literature is on changing the culture (and therein the structure) of schools. The process of reforming schools for inclusion is clearly one of reculturing which calls for school administrators who embrace the deeper meaning of inclusion, understand the need for beliefs-driven change, and know how to facilitate this in others. These are extremely high expectations by a bureaucratic educational system that for generations has institutionalized categorical thinking about individuals with disabilities.

The results of this study indicate that school administrators view inclusion through a restructuring lens with its focus on changing how schools are organized rather than on the beliefs, values, and principles underlying current categorical structures. This view is secured further into the culture of schools by central administration bureaucracies which mandate inclusion but do not relinquish their power to schools. To help school administrators think out of the categorical box, central administrations must not only mandate change but give ownership for it as well. All too often educators are held accountable for what they do not possess. As administrators in this study revealed, they are expected to own inclusion by special education administrations that continue to control many of the decisions they need to possess.

Additionally, school administrators need new skills to facilitate the kinds of change

needed. Addressing beliefs about inclusion and the problems it raises requires skills quite different than those school administrators use. They have not conceptualized their roles this way, and their administrative repertoires are limited and void of strategies that stimulate reflection, inquiry, critique, and collaboration. They are "overwhelmed" and do not know what to do.

References

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 34-64.

Boyd, W. (1992). The power of paradigms: Reconceptualizing policy and management. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29, 504-528.

Capper, C. A., Frattura, E., and Keyes, M. W. (2000). *Meeting the needs of students of ALL abilities: How leaders go beyond inclusion*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Capper, C. A., Theoharis, G. T., and Keyes, M. W. (1998). *The principal's role in inclusive schools for students with disabilities, empowering and democratic schools, and restructuring schools: A comparative analysis.* Paper presentation at the University Council of University Administrators. October 30-November 1, St. Louis, Missouri.

Chien, Y. & Capper, C. A. (1999). *The relationship between the principal and the director of pupil services in inclusive and traditional elementary schools.* Paper presentation at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, April 19-23, 1999, Montreal, Canada.

Comer, J. P. (1980). *School power: Implications of an intervention project*. New York: Free Press.

Constas, M. (1992). Qualitative analysis as a public event: The documentation of category development procedures. *American Educational Research Journal* 29(2), 253-266.

Council for Exceptional Children (1994). *Creating schools for all our students*. Reston, Virginia: Author.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Doyle, L. H. (1995). Multiple perspectives: A narrative of special education alternatives. *International Journal of Educational Reform,* 4(4), 450-459.

Doyle, L. H. (1998, April). *The overlap of perspective in leadership, teaching, organization, and context.* Paper presented at the American Education Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Doyle, L. H., & Huinker, D. (1995). *Transformation of schools into communities of learners: Involvement of school administrators.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

DuFour, R. (1995). Restructuring is not enough, *Educational Leadership* 52(4), 33-36.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37, 15-24.

Fawcett, G., Brobeck, D. Andrews, S., & Walker, L. (2001). Principals and beliefs-driven change. *Phi Delta Kappan* 82(5) pp. 405-410.

Falvey, M. (Ed.) (1995). *Inclusive and heterogeneous schooling: Assessment curriculum, and instruction.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Frohoff, K. H. & Lindle, J. C. (1998). *The leadership imperative: Sorting out special education directors' and principals' roles in educational excellence.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, St. Louis, MO, October 30, 1998.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of education change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces.* Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. K. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. *Harvard Educational Review,* 57(4), 367-395.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Glickman, C. D, Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2001). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach.* (5th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Goodman, J. (1992). *Elementary schooling for critical democracy.* New York: State University of New York (SUNY) Press.

Goodman, J. (1995). Change without difference: School restructuring in historical perspective. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(1), 1-28.

Gottlieb, J., Alter, M., & Gottlieb, B. W. (1991). Mainstreaming academically handicapped children in urban schools. In J. W. Lloyd, N. N. Singh, & A. C. Repp (Eds.), *The regular education initiative: Alternative perspectives on concepts, issues, and models* (pp. 95-112). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore Publishing Company.

Greenfield, W. D. (1993). Articulating values and ethics in administrator preparation. In C. A. Capper (Ed.), *Educational administration in a pluralistic society* (pp. 267-287). New York: State University of New York Press.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, May, 328-355.

Hargreaves, A. (1991). Contrived collegiality: The micropolitics of teacher collaboration. In J. Blase (Ed.), The politics of life in schools. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hargreaves, A. (1995). Renewal in the age of paradox. *Educational Leadership*, 52(4), 14-19.

Kauffman, J. M. (1989). The Regular Education Initiative as Reagan-Bush education policy: A trickle-down theory of education of the hard-to-teach. *Journal of Special Education*, 23(3), 256-278.

Kauffman, J. M. (1993). How we might achieve the radical reform of special education. *Exceptional Children*, 60(1), 6-16.

Lashley, C. A. (1992). *Position responsibilities and relationships in the evaluation of district level special education administrators*. Paper prepared for the Council of Administrators in Special Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 388 649).

Levin, H. M. (1988). *Accelerated schools for at-risk students*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University.

Levy, S. (1995). (1995). Inclusion demands top-down support for bottom-up implementation. *The School Administrator*, 56(6), 266-267.

Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1996). Inclusion, school restructuring, and the remaking of American society. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(4), 762-796

Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's classrooms*. Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing.

Malarz, L. (1996). Using staff development to create inclusive schools. *Journal of staff development*. 17(3), 8-11.

May, S. (1994). *Making multicultural education work*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters LTD, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

May, S. (1998). On what might have been: Some reflections on critical multiculturalism. In G. Shacklock & J. Smyth (eds.). *Being reflexive in critical educational and social research*. Falmer Press: London.

Murphy, J. (1991). Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pugach, M., & Lilly, M. S. (1984). Reconceptualizing support services for classroom teachers: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(5), 48-55.

Purpel, D. E. (1988). *The moral and spiritual crisis in education: A curriculum for justice and compassion in education*. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Reitzug, U. C. (1994). A case study of empowering principal behavior. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(2), 283-310.

Reynolds, M., Wang, M., & Walberg, H. 1987. "The Necessary Restructuring of Special and Regular Education." *Exceptional Children*, 53, 391-398.

Rude, H. A., & Anderson, R. E. (1992). Administrator effectiveness in support of inclusive schools. *Case In Point*, 7(1), 31-37.

Ryan, G. & Bernard, H. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 769-802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sarason, S. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schein (1985) *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sizer, T., (1992). *Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Skrtic, T. M., 1991. *Behind special education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization*. Denver: Love Publishing Company.

Slavin, R., Karweit, N., Madden, N., & Wasik, B. (1992). *Success for all: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Services.

Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children*, 51, 102-111.

Wonycott-Kytle, A. and Bogotch, I. (2000). Measuring reculturing in national reform Models. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10(2), 131-157.

Wonycott-Kytle, A. and Bogotch, I. (1997). Reculturing: Assumptions, beliefs, and values underlying the process of restructuring. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7(1), 27-49.

Villa, R. A. & Thousand, J. S. (2000). *Restructuring for caring and effective education: Piecing the puzzle together*. Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing.

Will, M. C. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. *Exceptional Children*, 52, 411-415.

Ysseldyke, J., Algozzine, B., & Thurlow, M. (1992). *Critical issues in special education* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Zepeda, S.J., & Langenbach, M. (1999). *Special programs in regular schools: Historical foundations, standards, and contemporary issues*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.